

Application No.: 10/650,552
Art Unit 2178

REMARKS

1. Claims 58-63 are pending. In response to the Office Action mailed 08/23/2006, the applicant hereby amends his application.

2. Claims 58-61 hereby are amended. New claims 64-68 hereby are presented.

3. The comments below are directed to the remaining claims 58-68.

4. Claims 59-63 were rejected under section 102 as being anticipated by Ramaley et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2002/0143691 (hereinafter "Ramaley").

In response, these claims have been amended to more clearly and more patentably distinguish the claimed invention over Ramaley. As a result, and for the reasons discussed below, these section 102 rejections are traversed.

Based on M.P.E.P. section 706.02, "for anticipation under 35 U.S.C. 102, the reference (Ramaley) must teach every aspect of the claimed invention either explicitly or impliedly. Any feature not directly taught must be inherently present".

In contrast, however, when claims 58-68 are compared to Ramaley, substantial differences become apparent. This is explained below.

Application No.: 10/650,552
Art Unit 2178

Claims 58 and 60-68 are dependent on their common parent claim 59. Referring now to claim 59, this claim, as amended and in its present form, is copied below:

CLAIM 59:

Line: Text:

1 *A method to distribute a document to one or more recipients comprising, the method*
2 *comprising, by a document distributing apparatus:*
3 *receiving the document from an originator, the document comprising a cover*
4 *paper sheet, the cover paper sheet including a cover sheet information, the cover*
5 *sheet information comprising a document distribution job information, and the*
6 *document further comprising one or more document paper sheets, the one or more*
7 *document paper sheets including a document sheet information, wherein the cover*
8 *paper sheet is separate and distinct from the one or more document paper sheets;*
9 *scanning the document cover paper sheet to provide the document*
10 *distribution job information;*
11 *distributing the document based on the document distribution job information*
12 *to one or more recipients; and*
13 *subsequent to distributing the document, receiving the document as such*
14 *document is returned from at least one recipient of the one or more recipients,*
15 *where the document that is received as being returned from the at least one*
16 *recipient includes cover sheet information that has been modified by the at least one*
17 *recipient.*

Application No.: 10/650,552
Art Unit 2178

Further, by comparing claim 59 to Ramaley, it is seen that Ramaley FAILS TO TEACH OR SUGGEST the following claim 59 limitations:

Line: Text:

3 *receiving the document from an originator , the document comprising a cover*
4 *paper sheet, the cover paper sheet including a cover sheet information, the cover*
5 *sheet information comprising a document distribution job information, and the*
6 *document further comprising one or more document paper sheets, the one or more*
7 *document paper sheets including a document sheet information, wherein the cover*
8 *paper sheet is separate and distinct from the one or more document paper sheets;*
9 *scanning the document cover paper sheet to provide the document*
10 *distribution job information;*

CLAIM 59, lines 3-10, EMPHASIS ADDED.

As a result, Ramaley DOES NOT ANTICIPATE claim 59 and, accordingly, claim 59 is allowable under section 102 over Ramaley.

Claims 58 and 60-68 are dependent on claim 59. As a result, claims 58 and 60-68 are also allowable under section 102 over Ramaley.

Accordingly, these section 102 rejections thus are traversed.

5. Claims 58-63 were rejected as being unpatentable over Anglin, Jr. et al., U.S. Pat. No. 5,892,591 (hereinafter "Anglin") and further in view of Hadfield et al., U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2004/0205653 (hereinafter "Hadfield").

In response, these claims have been amended to more clearly and more patentably distinguish the claimed invention over Anglin and Hadfield. As a result, and for the reasons discussed below, these section 103 rejections are traversed.

To begin, when claims 58-68 are compared to Anglin and Hadfield, substantial differences become apparent. This is explained in A-C below.

Application No.: 10/650,552
Art Unit 2178

A. First, as to Hadfield, by comparing claim 59 to Hadfield, it is seen that Hadfield FAILS TO TEACH OR SUGGEST the following claim 59 limitations:

Line: Text:

3 *receiving the document from an originator , the document comprising a cover*
4 *paper sheet, the cover paper sheet including a cover sheet information, the cover*
5 *sheet information comprising a document distribution job information, and the*
6 *document further comprising one or more document paper sheets, the one or more*
7 *document paper sheets including a document sheet information, wherein the cover*
8 *paper sheet is separate and distinct from the one or more document paper sheets;*
9 *scanning the document cover paper sheet to provide the document*
10 *distribution job information;*

CLAIM 59, lines 3-10, EMPHASIS ADDED.

B. Second, as to Anglin, the Office Action at Page 6 concedes that:

"Auglin [sic] does not disclose that the document that is received as being returned from the at least one recipient includes information that has been modified by the at least one recipient",

OFFICE ACTION, Page 6, EMPHASIS ADDED.

Thus, it is seen that Anglin FAILS TO TEACH OR SUGGEST the following claim 59 limitations:

Line: Text:

13 *subsequent to distributing the document, receiving the document as such*
14 *document is returned from at least one recipient of the one or more recipients,*
15 *where the document that is received as being returned from the at least one*
16 *recipient includes cover sheet information that has been modified by the at least one*
17 *recipient,*

CLAIM 59, lines 13-17, EMPHASIS ADDED.

Application No.: 10/650,552
Art Unit 2178

C. In conclusion, based on A-B above, when the invention of claim 59 is compared with the references Hadfield and Anglin, it is seen that substantial differences are apparent. But unless the references Hadfield and Anglin, by themselves, would have suggested not only these differences but the entire invention of claim 59, viewed as a whole, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made, the invention of claim 59 is allowable under section 103 over these references.

Claims 58 and 60-68 are dependent on claim 59. As a result, claims 58 and 60-68 are also allowable under section 103 over the references Hadfield and Anglin.

Accordingly, these section 103 rejections thus are traversed.

6. In summary, for the reasons discussed above, now it is believed the remaining claims 58-68 are allowable and the application is in condition for allowance. Further consideration of the application now is respectfully requested. If there are further questions, the Examiner is cordially invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number shown below.

Respectfully submitted,



Wayne J. Egan

Registration No. 33,168

Xerox Corporation

100 Clinton Avenue South

Xerox Square 20A

Rochester, New York 14644

Voice Phone: 585-423-4426